

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 10-20 are pending.

The claims have been amended where applicable, to remove “means for” language.

Claims 1 and 11 have also been amended to clarify these claims so as to distinguish clearly the subject matter of these claims. No new matter is being added.

On page 3 of the Office Action, numbered paragraph 2, the wording “bus guardians 311, 312, and 313” on page 4, line 26 of the specification is objected to on the grounds of containing an informality. The aforementioned text has therefore been corrected to: “bus guardians 311, 312, and 331” and the Examiner is thanked for pointing out this error.

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 11, 15-18, and 20 are currently rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by US patent no. 7,124,316 (hereinafter referred to as “Kopetz et al.”). Applicants are traversing this rejection.

The application presently contains two independent claims, namely claims 1 and 11. Below, Applicants explain that Kopetz et al. does not teach all of the elements of claims 1 and 11.

Kopetz et al. teaches a system and method for handling so-called SOS faults in a fault-tolerant distributed computer system (see col. 2, line 64 – col. 3, line 3). Referring to col. 3, lines 58-62, the system comprises four node computers K1, K2, K3, K4, each connected to one of two replicated central distributor units V1, V2. As explained at col. 3, lines 62-64, a guardian GUA is disposed between each output of a node computer and each input of the distributor unit. The guardian GUA is either designed to be independent or can be integrated into the distributor unit (col. 3, lines 64-65).

Kopetz et al. is silent as to whether the guardians are input guardians. Furthermore, Kopetz et al. describes very specific functionality of the guardians at col. 5, lines 22-34.

Turning to claim 1, claim 1 recites an arrangement for connecting a node in a distributed system containing fail-uncontrolled nodes, the arrangement comprising:

- a receiver for receiving signals from another node of the system
- a node guardian coupled to the receiver
- to control selectively reception according to a predetermined TDMA schedule
- of a message thereat so as to reduce reception of uncontrolled transmission from another node of the system.

However, the function of the system of Kopetz et al. is conveniently summarised at col. 2, line 64 – col. 3, line 3 thereof, namely the conversion of a message burdened with an SOS fault either (a) into a correct message, or (b) into a message that can be recognised by all receiving node computers as clearly incorrect. This is different to the selective control of reception of a message that is sent during a specific transmission slot of a TDMA schedule. It is pointed out that locking a channel during the internal time, T_{GUA} , as described at col. 3, lines 25-34 and col. 5, lines 30-34 of Kopetz et al., is not the same as selectively controlling reception according to a predetermined TDMA schedule.

It is therefore submitted that Kopetz et al. fails to disclose a guardian to control selectively reception according to a predetermined TDMA schedule of a message thereat, as recited in claim 1.

In view of the reasoning provided above, Applicant submits that Kopetz et al. does not anticipate claim 1.

Claims 2-6, and 10 depend from claim 1. By virtue of this dependence, claims 2-6, and 10 are also novel.

Claim 11 is a method of operating a node in a fail-uncontrolled distributed system corresponding to the arrangement of claim 1. Consequently, arguments set forth above in support of claim 1 apply equally to claim 11. As such, it is therefore respectfully submitted that Kopetz et al. fails to teach a node guardian controlling selectively according to a predetermined TDMA schedule reception of a message thereat, as recited in claim 11.

In view of the reasoning provided above, Applicant submits that Kopetz et al. does not anticipate claim 11.

Claims 12-20 depend from claim 11. By virtue of this dependence, claims 12-20 are also novel.

The case is believed to be in condition for allowance and notice to such effect is respectfully requested. If there is any issue that may be resolved, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned.

If Applicant has overlooked any additional fees, or if any overpayment has been made, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to credit or debit Deposit Account 503079, Freescale Semiconductor, Inc.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Freescale Semiconductor, Inc.
Law Department

Customer Number: 23125

By: /David G. Dolezal/
David G. Dolezal
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 41,711
Telephone: (512) 996-6839
Fax No.: (512) 996-6854